DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 621 RC 020 405

AUTHOR	Hyman, Drew
TITLE	Toward a Quality-of-Life Paradigm for Sustainable Communities.
PUB DATE	Jul 94
NOTE	7p.; In: Issues Affecting Rural Communities. Proceedings of an International Conference Held by the Rural Education Research and Development Centre (Townsville, Queensland, Australia, July 10-15, 1994); see RC 020 376.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Development; Cultural Influences; *Industrialization; Models; Political Influences; *Quality of Life; Role of Education; *Rural Development; Social Action; *Social Change; Social Values; *Sustainable Development
IDENTIFIERS	*Agrarianism; Paradigm Shifts; World Views

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests that current paradigms and world views guiding research for social action are inadequate for directing rural community change in a high-tech, global community. For several generations, the agrarian and industrial paradigms have been accepted as appropriate for guiding social change and development. However, there are problems associated with these paradigms. First, "rural development" is a concept that embodies conflicting paradigms. The word "rural" generally brings to mind images of rustic, pastoral, agriculture-based settings for the production of food and fiber. On the other hand, "development" denotes patterns of growth, concentration, urbanization, and industrialization. The result is both "paradigm gridlock" and "paradigm obsolescence." The quality-of-life paradigm (QoL) addresses inconsistencies concerning rural development and change. QoL emphasizes sustainability as integral to economic and community development. The QoL paradigm differs radically from the industrial paradigm by emphasizing the end results of social processes; stressing quality and flexibility instead of quantity and standardization; emphasizing individual choice through customization, diversity, and flexibility in contrast to standardization; promoting decentralization of power and control instead of centralization; focusing education and employment on generalization and multiple skills; and allowing for individual discretion that is in harmony with societal values. The QoL paradigm sets the standard for success by appropriate scale, rather than the bigger-is-better, most-is-best principle, and focuses on the overall community as the target of development. Contains 23 references. (LP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 621

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D McSwan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

TOWARD A QUALITY-OF-LIFE PARADIGM FOR SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

Drew Hyman — United States of America

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests that the mental images that guide human creativity and action, our paradigms for rural development, are inadequate for developing communities that can coexist with metropolitan areas in a high-tech, industrialized world, and it presents a contemporary alternative. For several generations the agrarian and industrial paradigms were accepted as appropriate for guiding social change and development. Since the mid 1960's, however, this duality has been challenged, indicating either that Kuhn's concept of paradigm is inapplicable to social science or we have been thrown into another iteration of paradigm development. Contemporary society faces both "paradigm gridlock," and "paradigm obsolescence." The paper explores the premise that our paradigms for rural development and change and presents an alternative to paradigm gridlock.

The mental images that guide human creativity and action are the most fundamental aspects of development and change. Without an image, an idea or a pattern toward which to build, no purposive change can occur. This is true for science, engineering, education, agriculture, the arts and other areas of human endeavour. It is important to recognize that all development concerns—theories, policies, plans, strategies, and actions—express ideas and values about what development is and should be. "These contrasting sets of beliefs and moral attitudes lie at the heart of the different ideological thought-worlds and their visions of the developed society; indeed, for many people the 'developed' society is virtually interchangeable with the 'good' society" (Goldsworthy, 1988). This means that the paradigms or models people bring to development issues place severe constraints around what they are willing to consider or even to perceive as possible.

Thomas Kuhn (1970) points out that "paradigm" has both general and specific applications.

On the one hand, it stands for the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on shred by the members of a given community. On the other, it denotes one sort of element in that constellation, the concrete puzzle- solutions which, employed as models or examples, can replace explicit rules as a basis for the solution of the remaining puzzles of normal science (Kuhn 1970. p. 175).

Paradigms are perspectives "that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners (Kuhn 1970, p. viii). They are applied without question by community members. They "look like laws of nature, but their function for group members is not often that alone. . . . they function in part as laws but also in part as definitions of some of they symbols they deploy" (Kuhn 1970, p. 183). They are the worldview, weltanschainung, combined with its meaning and value, and principles of action, with which people interact with the world (Edwards 1967, pp. 404A05;Berger and Luckman:1967).

Vision and values are thus inextricably intertwined as the fundamental bases for policy and action (Hyman and Miller: 1985, Hyman, Wadsworth and Alexander). The agrarian and industrial paradigms provide the worldview that guides most contemporary development policies. And, while the dictionary definition of "to develop" means to cause to become gradually fuller, larger, better, the intrinsic meaning of "development" differs according to one's worldview. Those following the agrarian model will seek "to develop" their household to better cope with the vicissitudes of nature and to provide a comfortable existence for their extended family. Those following the growth/modernization model will seek "to develop" their capital and increase resource utilization to produce more commodities or services for the marketplace. The differences in desires, goals, policies and actions are profound: one seeks family survival and the other seeks growth of capital.

The theme of this paper is that these paradigms are inadequate for guiding research and our worldviews for action are inadequate for guiding rural community change in our high-tech, global community, and it presents a contemporary alternative. Our reasoning begins with the premise that "rural development" is an internally inconsistent concept that embodies conflicting paradigms. The word "rural" generally brings to mind agrarian paradigm images of rustic, pastoral, agriculture-based settings for the production of food and fibre. "Development" denotes the patterns of growth, concentration, urbanization, and industrialization of the groNThlmodernization paradigm. The result is both "paradigm gridlock," and "paradigm obsolescence." A good part of the problem arises from the growth/modernization paradigm itself.

CONTEMPORARY ROOTS FOR A NEW PARADIGM

The first part of the twentieth century was dominated by the belief that industrialism, urbanism and growth were the future of mankind. Progress was viewed as a linear continuum from agrarian

RC 020405

to industrial society (Chart 1). Mid-twentieth century economists operationalize this paradigm as being manifest in "economic growth," sociologists as "modernization."2 The second part the century is characterized by realisation, especially in the developing areas, that the Agrarian Industrial resulting economic recipes did not lead to growth and modernization Chart 1 in many situations and eventually led to disillusionment with growth theories and a return to empirical observation and trial-and-error approaches that try to take into consideration a variety of locality specific factors. Many cultures may not want to emulate the West and wish to pursue a directions more compatible with a different worldview. Similar results occur when we try to apply it to rural development in industrialized nations.

Recent attempts to bring together the literature on development from several fields— sociology, economics and political science—tend to come to similar conclusions (Weitz 1986; Harrison 1988, Hunt 1989; Jaffee 1990; So 1990). Jaffee' review of the 2, Development" and "social change" are frequently used almost interchangeably, but they connote different concepts. Kornblum (1988, p. 566) considers social change to involve "variations over time in the ecological ordering of populations and communities, in patterns of roles and social interactions, in the structure and functioning of institutions, and in the cultures of societies." The social change literature is permeated by the assumption that economic, political and social change are part of a broader pattern of change—modernization—what varies along a traditional-modern continuum. This perspective is rooted in the works of Durkheim, Toennies, Max Weber, and Marx "Development", on the other hand, usually refers to some measurable form of "progress" along the modernization continuum, commonly measured by groffth in gross national product (GNP). Jaffee states that this perspective assumes that growth in GNP would bring improvement in all spheres of life. Thus "development" assumes that "the economy would be richer, jobs would be created, people would have more money, the quality of life would improve, poverty would disappear, industry would expand, and life as we know it in the advanced industrial economies would be reproduced in the less-developed nations." (Jaffee 1990, p. 8) main strains of development theory (traditional/modern continuum) and growth (GNP) theory concludes with the following statement:

> Today, neither the structural modernization thesis nor the GNP/states-of-growth model claims many adherents. . . . In place of these theoretical models one finds a preference for particular socio-economic arrangements and policies as the central societal-level dimensions responsible for development." (Jaffee 1990:112)

The search for new models to deal with what are seen as the problematic aspects of the growth/modernization model has most recently been encapsulated in the idea of sustainability. Sustainability has three dimensions: when, where, and what; time, space and substance. First, sustainability refers to prolonging natural and social processes over an extended period of time. It is thus future oriented. Second, it is concerned with broad geographic areas; spatially sustainability extends generally beyond a single person, farm, plantation, or corporation. It is community, region, nation or global in scope. Third, sustainability is concerned with the interrelation of both natural and social processes. It is thus integrative and interdisciplinary in regard to the substance or content of what is being sustained.

A whole systems perspective is essential to understanding sustainability. Individual units—whether they be individuals, families, groups, farms, corporations or communities—are viewed in their broader sense as units in a larger whole. The University of California, Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program puts it this way:

> Sustainability rests on the principle that we must meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Therefore, stewardship of both natural and human resources is of prime importance. Stewardship of human resources includes consideration of social responsibilities such as working and living conditions of labourers, the needs of rural communities, and consumer health and safety both in the present and the future. (University of California 1991, p. 1)

The report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (1987), known as the Bruntdland Report, defines sustainable development as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.". It notes some of the implications that follow from sustainable development are: changing the quality of economic growth; meeting human needs for jobs, food, energy, water, and sanitation; a sustainable level of population; conserving and enhancing the resource base; reorienting technology and managing risk; merging environmental and economic concerns in societal decision making. (Rodda: 1991, p. 44)

These emerging perspectives appear analogous to Kuhn's (1970) pre-paradigm stage, "where 'schools' compete with one another to have their view of a discipline, and their interpretations of data, accepted by others." Thus, it is appropriate for us to begin to articulate a paradigm that focuses on sustainability and the quality of life emerges.

ROOTS OF A NEW PARADIGM: IN SOCIETY

The agrarian and industrial paradigms are sociologically rooted in the positivistic organicism of Toennies and Durkheim. Toennies viewed society as being based in interdependence. He articulated two forms of society, gemeinschaft and gese//schaft. Gemeinschaft, rooted in superstition and mutual fear of the irrational, "being based upon consensus of wills—rests on harmony and is developed and ennobled by folkways, mores, and re'igion" (Etzioni 1964). People are tied to each other and to the land by the natural drive to survive. Gesehschaft is social order which, being based upon a union of rational wills, rests on convention and agreement, is safeguarded by political legislation, and finds its ideological justification in public opinion. Gese/lschaft is based on specialisation and division-of-labour which isolates families from others. Peace and commerce are maintained through conventions and the underlying mutual fear. Government protects this civilisation through legislation and politics (Toennies:1957; Etzioni 1964, p. 64-65).

Both of these visions see society as imperatively coordinated. There is some overall direction and control. Society is an identifiable, tangible entity, a collectivity that has interests, goals, values and decision making in and of itself. Today global society is not imperatively coordinated. Highly industrialized nations that participate in multinational trade and cultural interactions are comparable systems. Control appears to be fragmented among nations, multinational corporations and a variety of regional and sub-national groups and organizations.

A contemporary perspective views direction and control of the community as an interactional field of people, organizations and institutions, not as a single collective with a "head." From this perspective, the overall system is neither centrally controlled nor random and chaotic. An interactional system is characterized by a variety of systemic interconnections among relatively independent units. Warren (1978) notes that the actions of the parts are negotiated among the parts rather than being directed by a central controlling unit. The shared values and norms flow from a common macro-culture which guides decision making and action in many communities. The community does not act, its parts do; and the parts understand the rules of interaction. (Warren, 1978, p. 410.)

The emerging perspective sees society not as one ordered on coerced behaviour based on fear of a war of all against all; rather, the social contract is based on altruistic accommodation and mutual pursuit of the good life. The world community, and local communities for that matter, can be seen as a series of simultaneous games where the interactions of some have greater or lesser effects on the others (Polyani: 1951; Hyman and Miller:1985). The parts retain considerable separate identity and individual autonomy in interactional interdependence with others. Communities appear different from different viewpoints; their actions have different effects on different segments of society. We refer to this idea as "the kaleidoscopic community"—the structure is dependent on the interaction of many different individual units and it appears different from different observation points. This

perspective embodies the structural underpinnings of a different perspective, which we will call the quality-of-life paradigm, or simply, the QoL paradigm.

We chose the term "QoL paradigm" since the term implies a primary concern for the character of society and a focus on excellence (in contrast to the quantitative emphasis of the growth/modernization paradigm). This seems appropriate to descri[illegible] a society based on values which emphasise concern for substance and sustainability. It also conveys the idea of continual efforts to focus on long-term end results and end products. The QoL paradigm emphasises developing sustainable rural communities as integral to economic and community development. Hyman, Shingler and Gamm (1994) define a sustainable community as follows:

A "sustainable community" is one in which the full range of community values and services is available to its members, and it has the capacity to transform its internal and external relations to respond to changing circumstances—both internal and external. The delivery of goods and services may be accomplished either internally or through linkages with external systems and operations. Most importantly, the quality and level of goods and services and the access to values is equivalent to the levels of the broader society.

SIX "-IZATIONS" AND TWO PARADIGMS

The following ideas are explorative, intended to begin assembling the different aspects of what appears to be an emerging paradigm. Major themes of the QoL paradigm can be seen to emerge from considering the six "-izations" of Alvin Toffler's "Second Wave" of civilisation and what we believe may be their emerging counterparts. Industrial society is characterized by standardisation, centralisation, specialisation, synchronisation, concentration and maximisation (Toffler, 1980, Ch. 4). Table 1 compares Toffler's six -izations and their QoL paradigm alternatives.

Table 1
Major Themes of the Industrial and QoL Paradigms

Industrial Society	The QoL Paradigm
STANDARDIZATION AND PUNCTUALITY	CUSTOMIZATION, DIVERSITY, FLEXIBILITY
CENTRALIZATION	DECENTRALIZATION
SPECIALIZATION AND PROFESSIONALIZATION	GENERALIZATION AND MULTI-SKILLED
SYNCHRONIZATION	HARMONIZATION
CONCENTRATION	INDIVIDUALIZATION, DISPERSAL OF LARGE/SMALL, CENTRAL/PERIPHERY
MAXIMIZATION	OPTIMIZATION/APPROPRIATE SCALE

© 1994 Dave Hyman

A QoL paradigm will differ radically from the industrial paradigm. It emphasises the "ends" of social processes. Quality and flexibility are its hallmark compared to quantity and standardisation for its industrial alternative. The QoL paradigm stresses individual choice through customisation and diversity and flexibility in contrast to the industrial paradigm's other-determined tendency for standardisation and punctuality. Decentralization of power and control are the norm in both public and private sectors, and economy and government. Localities gain increased decisional autonomy-discretion—within broad societal policies. Education and employment tend toward generalization and multi-skilled individuals. People are trained in understanding and problem solving which can be applied to a number of fields. Serial careers may become the norm. Rather than industrial synchronisation of both individuals and organizations to the dictates of a central control, the QoL paradigm will allow individual discretion that is in harmony with societal values. Decision making will move toward the periphery, dispersed throughout society, rather than being concentrated in large centralized structures. The standard for success will be optimization marked by appropriate scale, rather than the bigger-is-better, most-is-best maximisation principle. The QoL paradigm eliminates the contradiction between "rural" and "development" because it focuses on the overall community as the target for development.

Our view is that the QoL paradigm does not replace the Theological Society others; it adds a third paradigm to the agrarian and industrial models. As depicted in Chart 2, this addition can be seen to create a multilinear, Agmr'•an • Industrial Socl ery Society multidirectional field bounded by three different continuum. The Chart 2 first continuum at the base of the triangle is the agrarian-industrial paradigm of the modernization/growth model. The second continuum is an agrarian/QoL continuum which suggests the possibility of a different direction for development than industrial/urban growth. Together these two continuum create a third dimension, the QoL-industrial society continuum. Triangulated, these three continuum create a developmental field or matrix. Identifying the general principles associated with the worldviews of the three paradigms allows us to begin to understand and make conscious decisions about their appropriateness for our society.

ASPECTS OF THE NEW PARADIGM: CULTURAL VALUES

Survival, Growth or Sustainability?

Table 2 compares underlying cultural values and perspectives of the three paradigms. The first two are drawn from previous works. The QoL paradigm is a paradigm appropriate for development in the kaleidoscopic community. The agrarian perspective sees mankind as being essentially at the mercy of the elements—nature or the gods. It leads to a fatalism that precludes future-oriented planning and actions to a great degree. If one has no way to control the vagaries of nature, it is futile to plan ahead. A degree of control can be achieved through superstitions which provide explanations for why things happen, and for attempts to know and placate the spirits, gods, or God. We are at the mercy of the gods.

The industrial paradigm is founded on a belief in rationality as a way to control nature and the destiny of mankind. The emergence of the scientific method, experimentation, leads to a belief that everything can be known and hence controlled if we just know how the parts work. The result is an attempt to take things apart, separate them into their component parts, to make them more productive. A main theme is understanding how things work and then creating the ideal future—a linear idea—progress. We can know and control everything.

The QoL paradigm is founded on a belief that Humankind must live in a symbiotic relationship with nature and others. The recognition of dynamic systems—not amenable to simple linear manipulation opens our minds and actions. The recognition of multilinear possibilities—based on present choices in the context of the choices of others and environmental dynamics—leads away

Table 2
Three Forms of Society: CULTURAL ASPECTS

Characteristic	AGRARIAN	INDUSTRIAL	QoL
DOMINANT DRIVES	Survival Heredity Family	Growth, control Accumulation. Class Status, Power	Sustainability Quality of Life Self-actualization, Community
RATIONALITY	Superstition Fatalism	Legal-rational Science as	Value-rational Science as
multilinear,	Custom	Linear analytic	and synthetic
COORDINATION choice	Obedience to	Control	Agreement
	tradition	domination/dependence	interdependence
COGNITION	Irrational, intuitive Superstition	Reason, positivist objectivity valued	Reason–positivist objective and subjective valued
"GOOD" the	What's good for	What's good for the	What's good for
	the family is good	individual is good	community is
good	for the individual	for society. (Egoistic)	for the individual (Altruistic)
RELATIONSHIP TO NATURE	Harmony with nature	Exploitative of nature competition with others	Partnership with nature and and others

© 1994 Dave Hyman

from a belief that all can be known and controlled to a belief in dynamic interdependence—the actions of each have implications for the outcomes of themselves and others and the actions of others have implications for the outcomes of themselves and others as well. This is not chaos—a randomisation of causes and effects—but interdependence of outcomes—the Kaleidoscopic community described above. Together we can work toward a high- quality sustainable society.

ASPECTS OF THE NEW PARADIGM: ECONOMY

Is more better? Or, is better better?

Table 3 compares economic aspects of the three paradigms. The QoL paradigm embodies the image of a global community. Thus, industrial society is one in which a few metropolises and mega-corporations become dominant. The QoL paradigm is one in which production and distribution systems are decentralised, characterized by intermediate scale units which emphasise appropriate technology and a balance between the core and periphery. Centralisation in industrial society would decrease opportunities for ownership and control. Decentralization in The QoL paradigm provides a higher number of opportunities for ownership and control in capitalist societies or for managing enterprises in socialist societies. The overall emphasis shifts from emphasis on quantity and maximising profit to quality and concern with satisfactory products.

Table 3
Three Forms of Society: ECONOMIC ASPECTS

Characteristic	AGRARIAN	INDUSTRIAL	QoL
ECONOMY	Family based; agrarian Prosumer	Corporation based; industrial Separation of producer and consumer Profits to owner, exploitation of producer (worker)	Appropriate Technology mfg./service/leisure Multi-faceted; e.g. profit sharing; "Share-ducer" (shareholder/producer)
ECONOMIC VALUES	Sustenance & Survival Sufficiency	Profit & Growth Accumulation Quantity Domination (monopolistic or oligopolistic tendency)	Product & Sustainability Satisfaction Quality True competition and/or collaborative relationships
INDUSTRY STRUCTURE coordination	Home, Village Crafts Self-directed	Large, Industrial Centralized control Imperative coordination	Intermediate level Decentralized Intentional (voluntary)
TECHNOLOGY	Small, Utility Manual	Speed, Quantity Mechanical, analog	Self fulfilling; Quality Mechanical, digital, cybernetic
WORKER RELATION TO PRODUCT	Makes Entire Product--Crafts Tied to land	Makes Part; Specialization Non-Skilled Labor tied to industry	Intrinsically significant --toward whole product Multi-functional worker Pursuit of career(s)
WORKER EDUCATION	Family Apprenticeships (employer responsibility)	Self or societal responsibility (Unskilled jobs or employers want society to provide skills.)	Society for basic, industry for specific
DIVISION-OF-LABOR	Little specialize	High specialization	Multiple skills
INCOME/CAPITA	Low/capita	High/capita; disparities	Fewer disparities
RELATIONSHIP TO ENVIRONMENT	Harmony with nature	Exploitative of nature Uses Non-renewable resources	Seeks Replacement Recycling; Permanence Uses Renewable resources

© 1994 Orio Ingram

There are significant implications for workers as well. In industrial society, jobs tend to be highly specialised, and structured to require minimum skills and training. Education for work tends to be either on-the-job or responsibility is placed on society to prepare people for jobs. In The QoL paradigm, the emphasis is toward producing intrinsically significant products or parts of products; this requires broader training and multiple skills. Education would be a mutually shared responsibility with society providing basic education and problem solving skills, and industry providing the specialised training required for specific jobs.

"Development" takes on fundamental differences in perspective in the paradigms. The orientation of economic units to society and the environment is different too. Industrial society tends to be exploitative of nature and capitalises on the use of "free" non-renewable resourCes. The QoL paradigm emphasises maximum use of renewable resources, recyCling, replacement and permanence. Industrial society tends to foster what is referred to as "development in communities": growth firms or industries reap the primary benefits of development with little concern for the Costs borne by the broader community.3 The costs of doing business are less than the costs of business. The QoL paradigm in Contrast, is concerned with "development of communities" in the broader perspective. Development addresses the implications of economic changes on the entire community context. The costs of doing business are the same as the costs of business.

ASPECTS OF THE NEW PARADIGM: SOCIAL

From Family to Bureaucracy to Community

Harrison's work on The Sociology of Modernization and Development finds general agreement among scholars on capitalism, at least the Western version of industrial capitalism. "The basic point is that, positive, negative or neutral, there is no argument about what is happening. Much the same might be said of capitalism, a more comprehensive example of modernity. Despite the acrimonious debates over definitions, it is generally agreed that, ideal-typically, capitalism involves numerous well documented social processes: the separation of individual workers from their means of production, a corresponding increase in wage labour and participation in a cash economy, landlessness and (at least initially) increased inequality, production for profit, large-scale, capital- intensive manufacturing, the application of technology to production, and a vastly extended division of labour—all involving widespread and disruptive changes in the social, cultural, economic and political fabric of societies." (Harrison: 1988, p. 156) Jaffee (1990, p.8) notes that even in nations that have experienced significant rates of economic growth, "many of the assumed positive by-products have not materialised. Rapid growth has not necessarily resulted in higher incomes for workers, better health care, more housing, a reduction in poverty or a more democratic or egalitarian society. On the contrary, there are numerous examples of rapid growth accompanies by a decline in the standard of living, increasing poverty, rising inequality, and political repression. In fact, these are frequently regarded as necessary, though hopefully temporary, conditions for growth."

Social organisation differs among the paradigms as well. The agrarian paradigm is centred around family, tribe or clan—others are Competitors and enemies. Industrial society changes the focus to formal organizations, bureaucraCy, separating individuals into roles and specializations. Interactions are controlled by imperative coordination. The QoL paradigm takes a broader perspective, looking at the multiple interactions of individuals in groups and communities. It tends toward integration of roles and mutual agreement in interactions. Lest we give the impression of economic determinism, it is clear that the social and political aspeCts of soCiety are different as well (Table 4). Industrial society exhibits imperative coordination which separates people from each other and fragments individuals, frequently into competing roles and responsibilities. The QoL paradigm emphasises intentional (voluntary/normative) coordination based on shared values and norms, and collaborative relationships rooted in mutual interdependence which tends to integrate and harmonise the relationships of individuals to each other and to society.

Table 4
Three Forms of Society: SOCIAL ASPECTS

Characteristic	AGRARIAN	INDUSTRIAL	QoL
SOCIETY	Family/Clan	Formal Or./Bureaucracy	Community/Global Society
SOLIDARITY	Mechanical physical force	Organic/egoistic/imperative	interactional/altruistic/ intentional (normative)
EDUCATION	By family and religion--for few	Secular, open to all Technical, specialized	Diversity, public & private generalist & specialist
LITERACY	Low--Generalist	High--Specialized	High--Generalist
CLASSES	Polarized into high and low Ascribed	Large middle classes-- strong vertical structure Achieved	Few classes-- multiple interests --Rather structure
ROLES	Interrelated Total person	Separation of roles-- personal, occupation, etc	Integration of roles
COGNITION	Irrational Superstition	Reason--scientific objectivity, dialogue	Mix of objective and and subjective. Recognize spiritual as option
RELATIONSHIPS	Diffuse obligations to others--custom	Specific obligations-- contractual. Distrust	Choice--contractual or diffuse. Mutual trust

© 1994 Orio Ingram

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The "egoistic" ethical perspective of industrial society puts the individual—person, family, corporation, nation—in first place. "What's good for General Motors is good for the World." The "altruistic" ethics of The QoL paradigm sees the good of the individual and society as being inextricably intertwined. The guiding criterion is that individuals see their well-being as being tied up with the well-being of others and the overall community. "Ask not what your community can do for you; ask what you can do in your community." As standardisation, specialisation and central control are dominant themes of industrial society, so diversity, choice, and intentional coordination are characteristic of the QoL model.

ASPECTS OF THE NEW PARADIGM: POLITICAL

From Tradition to Imperative Coordination to Intentional Communities

It follows that control—politics, government, management and decisionmaking—are fundamentally different in the paradigms as well (Table 5).

Table 5
Three Forms of Society: POLITICAL ASPECTS

Characteristic	AGRARIAN	INDUSTRIAL	QoL
COORDINATION	Coercion: strength	Imperative/domination domination/dependency	interactional: intentional interdependence/equal part
SOCIAL CONTROL	Fear, ritual, force	authority, threat	agreement, understanding
AUTHORITY	Traditional	Legal-rational	Value-rational
COMMUNITY	Geographically localized, simple Total community Supernatural model	Nation State Complex, high interdep Community of interests Linear model	Global community Local diversity Multiple communities Multilinear model
WEALTH AND POWER	Fixed, ascribed	Open, free-floating Elitist structure	More open, access to elites, mult. elites, pluralist
STRUCTURE	Diffuse	Centralized in legal political, and admin	Decentralized within overall network
RECRUITMENT	Fixed, ascribed	Open, free-floating based on wealth, status	open, free-floating wider bases
POLITICAL PARTICIPATION	Limited to higher strata	Increasing participation –toward mass parties	Demassification –toward many centers

Today, highly industrialized nations, global corporations that participate in multinational trade, trans-national organizations and cultural interactions all defy overall imperative coordination. At the same time religious, ethnic and tribal conflicts resist central control, and governments are immobilised by competing organizations and interest groups. Control appears to be fragmented among nations, multinational corporations and a variety of regional and sub-national groups and organizations. Societal direction and control are key elements in a new paradigm.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

It is clear that we are talking about much more than a transition to an "information age." The QoL paradigm differs radically from both agrarian and industrial society. The QoL paradigm is suited for a society dominated by mutual respect and well-being. It emphasises the "ends" of social processes. Quality and flexibility are its hallmark compared to quantity and standardisation for its industrial alternative. The QoL paradigm stresses individualisation through customisation and diversity and flexibility in contrast to industrial society's other-determined tendency for standardisation and punctuality. Decentralization of power and control are the norm in both public and private sectors, and economy and government. Localities gain increased decisional autonomy—discretion— within broad societal policies. Education and employment tend toward generalization and multi-skilled individuals. People are trained in understanding and problem solving which can be applied to a number of fields. Rather than industrial synchronisation of both individuals and organizations to the dictates of a central control, The QoL paradigm will allow individual discretion that is in harmony with societal values. Decision making will move toward the periphery, dispersed throughout society, rather than being concentrated in large centralized structures. The standard for success will be optimization marked by appropriate scale, rather than the bigger-is-better, most-is-best maximisation principle. The QoL paradigm eliminates the contradiction between "rural" and "development." It can end paradigm gridlock.

The underlying values that constitute the worldviews of the three paradigms are the conceptual filters through which all thought and action are screened. This process IS generally not conscious but rather occurs as one is perceiving things. However, once characteristics such as identified in Tables 1-4 above are made explicit, we have the option of choice—a QoL characteristic. The three paradigms can be operationalized by developing criteria for measuring the extent to which specific units (individuals, groups, organizations, communities, societies) reflect agrarian, industrial or QoL characteristics. It also follows that purposive action in one direction of the other could be pursued, yielding an infinite number of alternative futures as depicted in Chart 3.

While primarily heuristic at this point, we believe this perspective provides a vision of the future that includes viable roles for both rural communities and metropolitan areas as a basis for directing thought and action. Rural communities need not be relegated to decline or development on an industrial model—which portends their becoming non-rural. Nor do urban areas for that matter. The QoL paradigm allows communities to develop Theological according to a worldview that allows them to move in the direction of sustainable rural communities with QoL characteristics. The QoL Agrarian . • Industrial paradigm provides a vision of development that allows Chart 3 diversity and change, not a single path as with modernization, stages of growth and GNP theory. This alternative worldview envisions a future of quality and diversity with many types and sizes of Community in a single global system, none having or seeking dominance. If this all sounds somewhat idealistic, it is, for that is the nature of a worldview. At the same time, the alternative worldview is idealistic as well and with quite different consequences. The choice is ours.

REFERENCES

Berger, Peter L, and Thomas Luckmann. The Social Construction of Reality. Garden city, N.Y.: Anchor Books, (1967).

Dillman, Don A. "The Social Impacts of Information Technologies in Rural North America," Rural Sociology Vol. 50, No. 1, Spring, 1985.

Edwards, Paul, Ed. The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, N.Y.: The MacMillan company, (1967).

Goldsworthy, David. "Thinking Politically about Development," Development and Change, (SAGE), Vol. 19, (1988), pp. 505- 530.

Harrison, David. The Sociology of Modernization and Development, Routledge, (1988).

Hunt, Diana. Economic Theories of Development, Barnes and Noble Books, (1989).

Hyman, Drew. "Rural Development is challenge of the 1 990s," Farm Economics, USDA, cooperative Extension Service, Penn State University, (January/February 1991), pp. 1-4.

Hyman, Drew, John Shingler and Larry Gamm. "Paradigm Gridlock and the Two Faces of Technology," in Beaulieu and Mulkey, eds., Investing in People: The Human Capital Needs of Rural America, Westview Press, (Expected 1994).

Hyman, Drew and Joe A. Miller. Community Systems and Human Services, Kendall/Hunt Publishing company, (1985).

Hyman, Drew, Mike Wadsworth and David Alexander. "Values, Policy-Making, and Implementation," Administration and Society, Vol. 23, No. 3, (November 1991), pp. 310-332.

Jaffee, David. Levels of Socio-economic Development Theory, Praeger Publishers, (1990).

Kornblum, William. Sociology: A changing World, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, (1988).

Kuhn, T. S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago Press, (1970).

Martindale, Don. The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, (1960). "Ch. 4 "The Classical Period of Positivistic Organicism, pp. 78-98.

Naisbett, John. Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming Our Lives. New York: Warner, 1982.

Polyani, Michael. The Logic of Liberty. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, (1951).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rodda, Anabel. Women and the Environment, London, U.K. and New Jersey, U.S.A., (1991), p. 44, citing the Brundtland Report] [Rodda also has case studies from different countries.

So, Alvin Y. Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency and World-System Theories, Sage Publications, (1990).

Strange, Marty. Family Farming: A New Economic Vision, University of Nebraska Press, and Institute for Food and Development Policy, (1988), 311 pp., [ISBN 0-8032-4156-9], p.82.)

Toennies, Ferdinand. Community and society—Gemeipscfiaft& und Gese//schaft. trans. and ed., Charles P. Loomis. East Lansing, Mich.: The Michigan State University Press, (1957), pp. 223-233 are in Etzioni, Social Change, N.Y.: Basic Books, (1964), p. 64-82.

University of California. What is Sustainable Agriculture? Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program, (December 7,1991), paper.

Warren, Robert. The Community in America, Third Edition, Rand McNally College Publishing Company. (1978).

Weitz, Raanan. New Roads to Development, Greenwood Press, (1986).